



-:1:-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.MUHAMED MUSTAQUE

&

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE SHOBA ANNAMMA EAPEN

MONDAY, THE 24<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JUNE 2024 / 3RD ASHADHA, 1946

OP(KAT) NO. 557 OF 2023

AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 07.07.2023 IN OA NO.1430 OF 2022 OF  
KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

PETITIONER/S:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA,  
REPRESENTED BY THE ADDITIONAL CHIEF SECRETARY, FINANCE  
DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT OF KERALA, SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA., PIN - 695001
- 2 THE ADDITIONAL CHIEF SECRETARY,  
HOME, FIRE FORCE & VIGILANCE DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT OF  
KERALA, SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA., PIN -  
695001
- 3 THE STATE POLICE CHIEF,  
POLICE HEAD QUARTERS, VELLAYAMBALAM,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN: 695 010, KERALA., PIN - 695010
- 4 THE DIRECTOR GENERAL,  
FIRE & RESCUE SERVICES, HOME GUARDS & CIVIL DEFENCE,  
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL, FIRE AND RESCUE  
SERVICE, HOME GUARDS & CIVIL DEFENCE, FIRE FORCE  
JUNCTION, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA., PIN - 695001



-:2:-

- 5 THE DIRECTOR (TECHNICAL),  
KERALA FIRE & RESCUE SERVICES, FIRE FORCE JUNCTION,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA., PIN - 695001
- 6 THE DIRECTOR,  
DIRECTORATE OF SAINIK WELFARE, SAINIK WELFARE  
DEPARTMENT, VIKAS BHAVAN BUILDING, UNIVERSITY OF  
KERALA SENATE HOUSE CAMPUS, PALAYAM,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA., PIN - 695033  
BY ADV SR.GOVERNMENT PLEADER SHRI A.J.VARGHESE

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 AJAYAKUMAR.V,  
(EX-SERVICEMAN), AGED 59 YEARS, S/O R VIJAYAN NAIR,  
HOME GUARD NO.T, 126,TRAFFIC POLICE STATION,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM CITY, CURRENTLY RESIDING AT T.C  
7/1885(1), VIJAYALAYAM, C-108-1, ANASWARA LANE,  
SREECHITHRA NAGAR, PANGODE, THIRUMALA P.O,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA., PIN - 695006
- 2 RAJAMANI M,  
(EX-SERVICEMAN), AGED 53 YEARS, S/O MATHYAS NADAR,HOME  
GUARD NO.1.179,VANDIPERIYAR POLICE STATION, MURUKKADY  
P.O, KUMILY, IDUKKI, CURRENTLY RESIDING AT PUTHEN  
VEETIL,VISWANATHAPURAM P.O, MURIKKADI, KUMILY, IDUKKI,  
KERALA., PIN - 685535
- 3 KUNJUMON.T.K,  
(EX-SERVICEMAN), AGED 64 YEARS, S/O. KOCHERUKKEN,HOME  
GUARD NO.1.129 (RTD),VANDANMEDU, IDUKKI, CURRENTLY  
RESIDING AT THANNIKKAL KIZHAKKETHIL,BALAGRAM P.O, 3RD  
CAMP, IDUKKI, KERALA., PIN - 685552
- 4 MANIKANDAN T,  
(EX-SERVICEMAN), AGED 57 YEARS, S/O BALAKRISHNAN.P.K,  
HOME GUARD NO. M 160, THENHIPPALAM POLICE STATION,  
CALICUT UNIVERSITY P.O, MALAPPURAM, CURRENTLY RESIDING  
AT GEETH, KOYALIKKAL, KUTTOOLANGADI, AZHINHILLAM P.O,  
MALAPPURAM,, PIN - 673632
- 5 VIJAYA RAGHAVAN.M,  
(EX-SERVICEMAN),AGED 64 YEARS, S/O V C GOVINDANKUTTY



-:3:-

- NAIR (LATE), HOME GUARD NO. D 160 (RTD), KASABA POLICE STATION, PUTHIYARA P.O, KOZHIKODE, CURRENTLY RESIDING AT KEEZHEDATHU HOUSE, CHERUKULATHUR, MEDICAL COLLEGE (VIA), CHERUKULATHUR P.O, KOZHIKODE, KERALA., PIN - 673008
- 6 JAYAKUMAR S,  
(EX-SERVICEMAN), AGED 48 YEARS, S/O SANKARAN PILLAI, HOME GUARD NO. A 318, KAREELAKULANGARA POLICE STATION, NANGIRKULANGARA P.O, ALAPPUZHA, CURRENTLY RESIDING AT DEVIKRIPA, MUTHUKULAM, NORTH PO, ALAPPUZHA, KERALA., PIN - 690506
- 7 PAVITHRAN T N,  
(EX-SERVICEMAN), AGED 57 YEARS, S/O KRISHNAN NAIR.T.N (LATE), HOME GUARD NO. D 330, COASTAL POLICE STATION, VATAKARA, KOZHIKODE, RESIDING AT KPM HOUSE, PALAYAD NADA P.O (VIA) IRINGAL, KOZHIKODE, KERALA., PIN - 673521
- 8 VINAYA KUMAR.S,  
(EX-SERVICEMAN), AGED 50 YEARS, S/O. SANKARA PILLAI.P, HOME GUARD NO.T.01, CONTROL ROOM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM CITY, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, CURRENTLY RESIDING AT THULASI BHAVAN, EANIKKARA, KARAKULAM P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA., PIN - 695564
- 9 PUSHKARAN. M,  
(EX-SERVICEMAN), AGED 58 YEARS, S/O MADHAVAN. S, HOME GUARD NO. E 186, FIRE & RESCUE STATION, THRIIPPUNITHURA, ERNAKULAM, CURRENTLY RESIDING AT KRISHNA NIVAS, POTTENKAVU P.O, POOTHOTTA, ERNAKULAM, KERALA., PIN - 682307
- 10 GOPAKUMAR A K,  
(EX-PARAMILITARY MAN), AGED 55 YEARS, S/O. APPUKUTTAN NAIR, HOME GUARD NO. T.571, TRAFFIC STATION, PATTOM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, CURRENTLY RESIDING AT CHITHERAA VIHAR, VKRWA-18, KEERTHI GARDENS, OPPOSITE KUNNIL MARGIN FREE SHOP, VATTIYOORKAVU, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA., PIN - 695013
- 11 SANTHOSH KUMAR.K.G,  
(EX-PARAMILITARY MAN), AGED 52 YEARS, S/O K.M. GOPINATHAN, HOME GUARD NO N 129, FIRE & RESCUE STATION, SEETHATHODU, ANGAMOOZHI, PATHANAMTHITTA, CURRENTLY



-:4:-

- RESIDING AT KUTTIYANICKAL HOUSE, MAROORPALAM, KONNI  
P.O, PATHANAMTHITTA, KERALA., PIN - 689691
- 12 ASHOK KUMAR B,  
(EX-PARAMILITARYMAN), AGED 55 YEARS, S/O N BHASKARAN  
NAIR, HOME GUARD NO T.57, THUMPA POLICE STATION,  
STATION KADAVU, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, CURRENTLY RESIDING  
AT PAZHAYA NETTAYATHU VEEDU, NANNATTU KAVU, POTHENCODE  
P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA., PIN - 695584
- 13 AJI. R ,  
(EX-SERVICEMAN), AGED 49 YEARS, S/O RAGHAVAN A, HOME  
GUARD NO. Q.10, KARUNAGAPPALLI POLICE STATION,  
KARUNAGAPALLI, KOLLAM, CURRENTLY RESIDING AT  
SAROVARAM, MARU SOUTH, ALAMKADAVU P.O, KARUNAGAPALLI,  
KOLLAM, KERALA., PIN - 690573
- 14 THOMAS PHILIP ,  
(EX-SERVICEMAN), AGED 60 YEARS, S/O PHILIP K.P, HOME  
GUARD NO.1.180, KUMILI POLICE STATION, KUMILI, IDUKKI,  
RESIDING AT KURIYANNOOR HOUSE, LABBAKKANDOM,  
KUMILI.P.O, IDUKKI, KERALA., PIN - 685509
- 15 BIJU P ,  
(EX-SERVICEMAN), AGED 49 YEARS, S/O K. PRABHAKARAN,  
HOME GUARD NO.1.120, PEERUMEDU POLICE STATION, IDUKKI,  
RESIDING AT PUTHEN PARAMBIL HOUSE, PASUMALA ESTATE,  
VANDIPERIYAR P.O, IDUKKI, KERALA., PIN - 685533
- 16 AJAYAKUMAR P.V,  
(EX-SERVICEMAN), AGED 65 YEARS, S/O. VASUPANICKER P.N,  
HOME GUARD NO. A. 279 (RTD), FIRE AND RESCUE STATION,  
HARIPPAD, KUMARAPURAM PO, ALAPPUZHA, RESIDING AT USHUS  
HOUSE, THAMULLACKAL SOUTH PO, ALAPPUZHA, KERALA., PIN  
- 690548
- 17 NAVAS H,  
(EX- PARAMILITARY MAN), AGED 55 YEARS, S/O HASSAN  
T(LATE), HOME GUARD NO. A67, TRAFFIC UNIT, ALAPPUZHA,  
RESIDING AT FIRDOUS, A.N. PURAM, PAZHAVEEDU P.O,  
ALAPPUZHA, KERALA., PIN - 688006
- 18 PRADEEP K.P,  
(EX-PARAMILITARY MAN), AGED 55 YEARS, S/O P.K  
MADHUSOODANAN NAIR (LATE), HOME GUARD NO.P 167,



2024/KER/45493

O.P.(KAT).No.557/2023

-:5:-

MALAMPUZHA POLICE STATION, MALAMPUZHA, PALAKKAD,  
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT SANKEERTHANAM, KAREKATTU  
PARAMBU, AMBIKAPURAM P.O, PALAKKAD, KERALA., PIN -  
678011

BY ADVS.  
JINSON OUSEPH  
S.VIJAYAN  
V.PRINCE DEV  
C.RAJESWARA KUMAR  
CHITRA VIJAYAN  
BASIL MECHERY  
NIMISHA GEORGE  
AMALENDU N.S.

THIS OP KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HAVING COME UP FOR  
ADMISSION ON 24.06.2024, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE  
FOLLOWING:



-:6:-

**J U D G M E N T**

**"C.R"**

A.Muhamed Mustaque, J.

The State has come up with this original petition aggrieved by the direction in an application filed by the respondents who are Home Guards working in the State, challenging a government order repelling the request for parity in pay with that of Police Constable in the light of the judgment of the Apex Court in **Home Guards Welfare Assn. v. State of H.P.** [ (2015) 6 SCC 247] (for short, the '**Grah Rakshak** case')

2. The Tribunal granted the following reliefs:

- i. Home Guards in the State are entitled to periodical revision of wages in tune with the pay revision orders issued from time to time.
- ii. Home Guards are entitled for monthly wages equal to the minimum wage of the scale of pay attached to the post of Civil Police Officer.

3. The Home Guards are currently engaged on a daily wage basis. The State enacted the Kerala Home Guards Act, 1960 for use in emergencies and for other purposes in the State of Kerala. The



-:7:-

Government also established Home Guard Rules to regulate the engagement of Home Guards. Based on these Act and Rules, the Government issued an order dated 26/11/2009 implementing a scheme for the engagement of Home Guards. The maximum number of Home Guards personnel has been limited to 3000. Home Guards can be utilized for enumerated purposes in which includes fire fighting, rescue operations, traffic control and regulation etc. As per the Government order dated 26/11/2009, Home Guards will be entitled to a stipend of Rs.250/- per day for each day of duty and they will not be eligible for any other allowances like TA/DA etc. However, they will be entitled to an allowance for uniforms.

4. In the **Grah Rakshak** case (*supra*), the Apex Court considered a question involving Home Guards from the State of Himachal Pradesh, Punjab and NCT of Delhi. The question that was considered was whether they should be regularised in the service or not. The Apex Court was of the view that they are not entitled for regularisation and ordered as follows:



-:8:-

22. In view of the discussion made above, no relief can be granted to the appellants either regularization of services or grant of regular appointments hence no interference is called for against the judgments passed by the Himachal Pradesh, Punjab and Delhi High Courts. However, taking into consideration the fact that Home Guards are used during the emergency and for other purposes and at the time of their duty they are empowered with the power of police personnel, we are of the view that the State Government should pay them the duty allowance at such rates, total of which 30 days (a month) comes to minimum of the pay to which the police personnel of State are entitled. It is expected that the State Governments shall pass appropriate orders in terms of aforesaid observation on an early date preferably within three months.

5. The Union Government, taking note of the above directions, also issued directions to the State Government to revise the pay. The State Government enhanced their pay from Rs.750/- per day, that was prevalent in the year 2019 to Rs. 780/- per day, subject to a maximum monthly pay of Rs.21,060/-. The respondent applicant, not satisfied with the enhancement, raised a representation before the Government. The Tribunal directed the Government to consider the representation. The Government, noting that they had already increased and revised their pay, was of the opinion that there is no further scope for revision. This decision was further challenged before the Tribunal and the Tribunal granted orders as above. The Tribunal while passing the order, apart





-:9:-

from relying on the judgment in **Graha Rakshak** case (*supra*) also relied on the judgment in Annexure A16 **Prakash Kumar Jena v. The State of Odisha** [2023 Livelaw SC 213] for granting reliefs. We shall now advert to **Graha Rakshak** case. It is to be noted that the Apex Court had not adjudicated that the Home Guards shall be treated at par with Police Constables or Civil Police Officers. The principle of “equal pay for equal work” was not decided by the Apex Court in the above judgment. We are of the view that the Tribunal misread the ratio in the above case and went on to hold that the Home Guards shall be treated at par with the Civil Police Officers in the State.

6. The doctrine of “equal pay for equal work” emphasises the nature of work undertaken by the worker. If the skills, effort, job undertaken and responsibilities involved are comparable and same, then a difference in pay cannot be justified by any other arbitrary classifications.

7. In **Randhir Singh v. Union of India & Ors.** [1982 AIR 879], it was held that essentially, the principle of equal pay for equal work transcends titles and genders. It focuses on the content of the job



-:10:-

– the skills required, the duties performed, and the level of responsibility shouldered. If two positions, regardless of rank or gender, involve similar work demands, then equal pay should be ensured.

8. In the **State of Punjab v. Jagjit Singh** [(2017) 1 SCC 148] the Apex Court had laid down the parameters which would invoke the principle of “equal pay for equal work”. The Court deduced the following criteria by analysing the legal position which the Court held in various cases;

1. The person who approaches the Court has the onus of proving that there is parity in the duties and responsibilities of the two posts in consideration for the application of equal pay for equal work [Orissa University of Agriculture & Technology v. Manoj K. Mohanty, 2003 SCC (L&S) 645 ; Union Territory Administration, Chandigarh v. Manju Mathur, 2011 (2) SCC 452]
2. Merely because two workers who perform identical functions, belong to different department heads cannot be treated differently in matters of pay (Randhir Singh vs Union Of India & Ors, 1982 AIR 879 ; D.S. Nakara & Others vs Union Of India, 1983 AIR 130)
3. In order to attract the principle of equal pay, the concerned workers who are being compared, must perform not just functional work but also work that is of the same quality and sensitivity. (*Randhir Singh vs Union Of India & Ors, 1982 AIR 879 ; Federation of All India Customs vs. Union of India, 1988 AIR 1291 ; Mewa Ram Kanojia vs All India Institute Of*



-:11:-

*Medical Sciences, 1989 AIR 1256 ; Grih Kalyan Kendra Workers' Union v. Union of India 1991 AIR 1173 ; S.C.Chandra vs State Of Jharkhand, AIR 2007 SC 3021)*

4. Even amongst workers holding the same designation or rank but not having the same responsibilities, duties and powers, they may be placed in different pay scales. [*Randhir Singh vs Union Of India & Ors, 1982 AIR 879 ; State of Haryana v. Haryana Civil Secretariat Personal Staff Association, 2002 (6) SCC 72 ; Hukum Chand Gupta v. Director General, Indian Council of Agricultural Research, 2012 (12) SCC 666*]
5. Pay disparity would be considered as valid classification if the two posts under consideration have duties with unequal degrees of sensitivity, reliability, confidentiality and responsibility. [*Federation of All India Customs vs. Union of India, 1988 AIR 1291; State Bank of India v. M.R. Ganesh Babu, 2002 (4) SCC 556*]
6. Even workers performing the same functions and responsibilities may be allotted to different pay scales in the same post like "selection grades". However, this differentiation must be premised on a legitimate foundation having a rational nexus and relevant criteria like merit, seniority etc may be considered. Here, the principle cannot be invoked. [*State of U.P. vs. J.P. Chaurasia, 1989 AIR 19*]
7. When two posts being considered have different qualification requirements, it is concluded that the posts are qualitatively different. Thus the principle does not apply [*Mewa Ram Kanojia vs All India Institute Of Medical Sciences, 1989 AIR 1256 ; Government of W.B. v. Tarun K. Roy 2004 (1) SCC 347*]
8. The post with which a worker claims parity, must be at the same level in the hierarchy as the post held by the worker at present. Different levels in the hierarchy can have different pay scales even if the duties may seem similar [*Union of India v. Pradip Kumar Dey, ( 2000 ) 8 SCC*



-:12:-

*580 ; Hukum Chand Gupta v. Director General, Indian Council of Agricultural Research, 2012 (12) SCC 666]*

9. When the two posts being compared are either under different establishments, which might even be in different geographical locations or have different management, though under common ownership, it does not attract the principle. Moreover, if the workers are engaged differently and paid using different funds , they would not get pay parity. [*Official Liquidator v. Dayanand, (2008) 10 SCC 1*]
10. If one of the posts from among the two being considered is one exposed to higher operational work or risks and is accompanied by decision making power, which the other post lacks, pay parity cannot be mandated. [*State Bank of India v. M.R. Ganesh Babu, 2002 (4) SCC 556*]
11. If certain posts get priority by virtue of prevailing government policies, here the principle does not apply. [*State of Haryana v. Haryana Civil Secretariat Personal Staff Association, 2002 (6) SCC 72*]
12. . If certain posts get priority by virtue of prevailing government policies, here the principle does not apply. [*State of Haryana v. Haryana Civil Secretariat Personal Staff Association, 2002 (6) SCC 72*]
13. Merely because the two posts being considered, held the same pay scale at one point in the past, claiming parity in pay at present is not a rational application of the principle. The deciding factor must always be whether the duties and functions discharged are the same. [*State of West Bengal v. West Bengal Minimum Wages Inspectors Association, (2010) 5 SCC 225*]
14. In order to claim parity in pay using the principle, the primary nature of duties is of utmost importance. If one post has the primary duty of teaching and if the other post is purely non-teaching, the principle is not



-:13:-

applicable. [*Union Territory Administration, Chandigarh v. Manju Mathur, 2011 (2) SCC 452*]

15. Classification may be said to be valid if the employees hold posts with the same names but at different levels, like headquarters and sub office levels. Here the principle cannot be invoked [*Hukum Chand Gupta v. Director General, Indian Council of Agricultural Research, 2012 (12) SCC 666*]
16. In some scenarios, fairness can also involve recognizing experience and performance, even within the same job title, especially if there are limited opportunities for advancement and promotions, higher pay might sometimes be given to those discharging same duties and thus the principle would not be applicable. [*Hukum Chand Gupta v. Director General, Indian Council of Agricultural Research, 2012 (12) SCC 666*]
17. There can be no equation in pay scales when no comparison exists between employees of two different organisations or two different entities holding management and control, even if they have the same employer. [*S.C.Chandra vs State Of Jharkhand, AIR 2007 SC 3021 ; National Aluminium Company Ltd. vs. Ananta Kishore Rout, (2014) 6 SCC 756*]

9. Home Guards are recruited on daily wages and are engaged from those who have been retired from the Military, Navy, Air Force etc. The recruitment and selection process for Home Guards and Civil Police Officers are different. Home Guards were appointed on daily wages for assisting the personnels of Fire and Rescue Service and Police Department in their official duties. Neither a substantive post was



-:14:-

created for them nor they were appointed on the basis of selection conducted through any exam. It is to be noted that neither the Apex Court nor the Tribunal's impugned judgment adjudicated that Home Guards should be treated at par with the Civil Police Officers. The judgment of the Apex Court is binding nationwide and to cite a judgment as binding, the ratio of that said judgment will have to be considered. The Apex Court had not declared in **Grah Rakshak** case (*supra*), that Home Guards shall be treated at par with Civil Police Officers. In the absence of any such declaration by the Apex Court, the Tribunal could not have made such a ruling declared so. The Apex Court only stipulated that the pay for Home Guards should be at such rate totalling 30 days in a month, must come to a minimum pay to which the Police personnels in the State are entitled to. The applicants have no case that they have been paid much lower than the minimum of pay being paid to any Police Officer, if the total allowance for 30 days taken together. We note in subsequent judgment in **Prakash Kumar Jena's** case (*supra*), wherein the Apex Court affirmed the judgment of the Division Bench of Orissa High Court, which ordered payment of Rs.530/- per day available to



-:15:-

Constables in Orissa State in the lowest rank and ordered that such amount will be paid with retrospective effect.

10. We have noted the pleadings and prayers in the original petition. It appears that the respondents Home Guards are claiming a scale of pay at par with the Police Constables. The Government by an order dated 11/2/2021 fixed the daily wages of Home Guards at Rs.780/- per day and maximum payable in a month at Rs.21,060/-. That means, the Government has revised the pay and daily wages of the Home Guards. The Government while passing the order dated 2/2/2019, produced as Annexure A7, originally fixed daily wages as Rs.750/- per day with a maximum of Rs.21,000/-, taking note of the judgment in **Grah Rakshak** case (*supra*) subsequently it was increased to an amount of Rs.780/- per day to the maximum of Rs.21,060/-, as per government order dated 11/2/2021. In the absence of a claim that this is at par below the minimum wages paid to Police Constables, there is no scope for issuing a direction by the Tribunal. However, we make it clear that when there is an increase in the minimum wages payable to the minimum pay of the Police personnel, the State is bound to revise



-:16:-

the daily wages payable to the Home Guards at par with such minimum wages.

11. The direction in the impugned judgment to revise the daily wages payable to Home Guards based on pay revision order has to be understood as to mean that, when minimum pay to the Police personnel has been increased wherein such persons have also been affected in regard to the daily wages paid to the Home Guards.

Clarifying the impugned order as above, we set aside the second part of the impugned judgment directing the Government to pay wages at par with the Civil Police Officer. The Original Petition is disposed of as above.

**Sd/-**

**A.MUHAMED MUSTAQUE, JUDGE**

**Sd/-**

**SHOBA ANNAMMA EAPEN, JUDGE**

ms





-:17:-

APPENDIX OF OP(KAT) 557/2023

PETITIONER ANNEXURES

- Annexure A1 ANNEXURE A1: TRUE COPY OF THE KERALA HOME GUARDS ACT 1960.
- Annexure A1(a) ANNEXURE A1(A) : TRUE COPY OF THE KERALA HOME GUARDS AMENDMENT RULES, 2009 GO(MS)NO. 179/2009/HOME DATED 12.11.2009.
- Annexure A2 ANNEXURE A2: TRUE COPY OF THE GO(MS)NO. 190/2009/HOME DATED 26.11.2009 ISSUED BY THE 2ND PETITIONER.
- Annexure A3 ANNEXURE A3: TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO.D1-4858-2011 DATED 17.05.2011 ISSUED BY THE STATE PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER OF THE OFFICE OF THE 4TH PETITIONER.
- Annexure A4 ANNEXURE A4: TRUE COPY OF THE ABSTRACT OF THE JUDGMENT IN GRAH RAKSHAK HOME GUARDS WELFARE ASSOCIATION VS. STATE OF H.P AND ORS (2015 SUPP AIR(SC)889 ) OF APEX COURT.
- Annexure A5 ANNEXURE A5: TRUE COPY OF THE GO(MS)NO. 84/2016/HOME DATED 03.03.2016 ISSUED BY THE 2ND PETITIONER.
- Annexure A6 ANNEXURE A6: TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO.F3-6310/2018 DATED 22.09.2018 FORWARDED BY THE 4TH PETITIONER TO THE 1ST PETITIONER.
- Annexure A7 ANNEXURE A7: TRUE COPY OF THE GO(RT)NO. 18/2019/HOME DATED 02.02.2019 ISSUED BY THE 2ND PETITIONER.
- Annexure A8 ANNEXURE A8: TRUE COPY OF THE GO(P)NO. 29/2021/FIN DATED 11.02.2021 WITH ANNEXURE ISSUED BY THE 1ST PETITIONER.
- Annexure A9 ANNEXURE A9: TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGE PERTAINING TO THE PAY SCALES OF DIFFERENT CATEGORIES OF POLICE PERSONNEL INCLUDING POLICE CONSTABLES OF KERALA POLICE ISSUED VIDE GO(P)NO.27/2021/FIN DATED 10.02.2021 BY THE 1ST PETITIONER.



-:18:-

- Annexure A10 ANNEXURE A10: TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO.F3-6310/2018 DATED 04.08.2021 ISSUED BY THE 4TH PETITIONER.
- Annexure A11 ANNEXURE A11: TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 14.06.2021 FORWARDED BY ADGCD (COMN) OF MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA TO THE CHIEF SECRETARY GOVERNMENT OF KERALA AND OTHER CHIEF SECRETARIES AND ADMINISTRATORS OF OTHER STATES.
- Annexure A12 ANNEXURE A12: TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 24.01.2022 SUBMITTED BY RESPONDENTS 1 TO 12 BEFORE THE 1ST PETITIONER.
- Annexure A13 ANNEXURE A13: TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 19.10.2021 SUBMITTED BY RESPONDENTS 13 TO 18 BEFORE THE 1ST PETITIONER.
- Annexure A14 ANNEXURE A14: TRUE COPY OF THE COMBINED ORDER DATED 08.02.2022 OF THIS TRIBUNAL IN OA.1960 AND 1987 OF 2021.
- Annexure A15 ANNEXURE A15: TRUE COPY OF THE GO (RT) NO.1703/ 2022/HOME DATED 21.06.2022 OF THE 1ST PETITIONER.
- Annexure R2 (a) ANNEXURE R2 (A) :- TRUE COPY OF GO (RT) NO. 1847/2021/HOME, DATED 01.07.2021 ISSUED BY HOME (F) DEPARTMENT.
- Annexure R2 (b) ANNEXURE R2 (B) :- TRUE COPY OF GO (P) NO. 112/ 2018/FIN DATED 21.07.2018 ISSUED BY FINANCE (EXPENDITURE-C) DEPARTMENT.
- Annexure A16 ANNEXURE A16: ABSTRACT OF THE TRUE COPY OF THE HON'BLE APEX COURT JUDGMENT DATED 17.03.2023 IN CIVIL APPEAL NOS.8836, 8837 AND 8838/2022, IN PRAKASH KUMAR JENA AND ORS V. STATE OF ODISHA AND ORS (2023 LIVE LAW (SC) 213).
- Exhibit P1 EXHIBIT P1: TRUE COPY OF THE O.A NO. 1430/2022
- Exhibit P2 EXHIBIT P2: TRUE COPY OF REPLY STATEMENT FILED ON 03.10.2022 BY THE 5TH PETITIONER HEREIN IN THE ORIGINAL APPLICATION.



-:19:-

- Exhibit P3                    EXHIBIT P3: TRUE COPY OF REPLY STATEMENT  
FILED ON BEHALF OF THE 1ST AND 2ND  
PETITIONERS HEREIN ON 20.12.2022 ALONG WITH  
ANNEXURES IN THE ORIGINAL APPLICATION.
- Exhibit P4                    EXHIBIT P4: TRUE COPY OF REJOINDER FILED BY  
THE RESPONDENTS ON 22.02.2023 AGAINST THE  
REPLY STATEMENT OF THE 5TH PETITIONER  
HEREIN IN THE ORIGINAL APPLICATION.
- Exhibit P5                    EXHIBIT P5: TRUE COPY OF REJOINDER FILED BY  
THE RESPONDENTS ON 22.02.2023 AGAINST THE  
REPLY STATEMENT OF THE 1ST AND 2ND  
PETITIONERS HEREIN IN THE ORIGINAL  
APPLICATION.
- Exhibit P6                    EXHIBIT P6: TRUE COPY OF M.A.NO.677/2023  
FILED BY THE RESPONDENTS ON 30.03.2023  
ALONG WITH ANNEXURE.
- Exhibit P7                    EXHIBIT P7: TRUE COPY OF FINAL ORDER OF THE  
KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL DATED  
07.07.2023 IN OA 1430/2022